

Application No.: 10/583,319

Docket No.: JCLA21090

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lewis.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram in view of Ertl et al.

Claims 4-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended claim 1, support for which can be found throughout the specification and the drawings, e.g., Figs. 1b and 2.

Applicant has also rewritten claim 4 including all of the limitations of the base claim, i.e., claim 1 as originally filed hereby, and thus submits claims 4-8 are now in allowable forms.

Applicant has further added new claim 9, which is novel and unobvious over Lewis, Ingram, Ertl et al., or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Application No.: 10/583,319

Docket No.: JCLA21090

Discussion of the Office Action Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lewis.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram in view of Ertl et al.

Responsive to the 102 rejections to claims 1 and 2 and 103 rejections to claims 1 and 3, Applicant has amended claim 1, and hereby otherwise traverse these rejections.

As currently amended, claim 1, recites in parts:

A prefabricated boat comprising:

a) a body part being composed of a plurality of division members capable of being assembled one to another along a longitude direction of the prefabricated boat;

...

c) an air tube ... to apply a compression force to the body part substantially along the longitude direction,


... (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit Lewis, Ingram, Ertl et al., or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination fail to teach the claimed limitation of "a) a body part being composed of a plurality of division members capable of being assembled one to another along a longitude direction of the prefabricated boat" and "c) an air tube ... to apply a compression force to the

Application No.: 10/583,319


Docket No.: JCLA21090

body part substantially along the longitude direction".



As shown in Fig. 2 of Lewis as recited above, items 23 and 8 which are interpreted as division members of the body part are separately configured and are not to be assembled one to another along a longitude direction. Further the item 2 which is interpreted as an air tube does not provide a compression force to the body part substantially along the longitude direction".

Therefore, Applicant submits the present invention as set forth in claim 1, is novel and unobvious over Lewis, and thus the 102 rejection relying thereon should be withdrawn.




As shown in Figs. 7-9, Ingram teaches a body part composed of a plurality of division

Application No.: 10/583,319

Docket No.: JCLA21090

members capable of being assembled. However, Ingram's division members do not satisfy the further limitation currently imposed to claim 1, that is "capable of being assembled one to another along a longitude direction of the prefabricated boat".



Further, as shown in Fig. 1, Ertl et al. teaches air tubes. However, such air tubes do not satisfy the further limitation currently imposed to claim 1, that is "an air tube ... to apply a compression force to the body part substantially along the longitude direction".

Therefore, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 as currently amended, is submitted to be novel and unobvious over Ingram, Ertl et al., or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit the present invention, as set forth in claim 1, and its dependent claims 2 and 3 are novel and unobvious over Lewis, Ingram, Ertl et al., or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Application No.: 10/583,319

Docket No.: JCLA21090

Claims 4-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has rewritten claim 4 including all of the limitations of the base claim, i.e., claim 1 as originally filed hereby, and thus submits claims 4-8 are now in allowable forms.

New Claim

Applicant has further added new claim 9, which is submitted to be novel and unobvious over Lewis, Ingram, Ertl et al., or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-8 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: 8-29-2007

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330